(SRI M. P. PATIL)

Members are worth consideration and the Select Committee will take those suggestions into consideration and make the necessary changes in the present provisions of the Bill. Therefore, I do not want to refer to them.

With these remarks I hope the Hon'ble House will accept this Bill as it is as far as the principles of the Bill are concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

"That the Mysore Land Record of Rights Bill, 1958 be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Motion to refer.

Sri M. P. PATIL.—Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Mysore Land Record of Rights Bill, 1958, be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following members:—

1 The Minister for Law
2 Sri A. Bheemappa Naik
3 ,, B. D. Jatti
4 ,, K. Puttaswamy
5 ,, Basangowda
6 ,, K. Mallappa (Coorg)
7 ,, Manjaya Shetty
8 ,, B. N. Boranna Gowda
9 ,, K. Kenchappa
10 ,, B. K. Puttaramiah
11 ,, B. R. Patil
12 ,, V. S. Patil and
13 the mover

with instructions to report to the House within 10 days."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

"That the Mysore Land Record of Rights Bill, 1958, be referred to a Select Committee consisting of the following members:—

1 The Minister for Law
2 Sri A. Bheemappa Naik
3 ,, B. D. Jatti
4 ,, K. Puttaswamy
5 ,, Basangowda
6 ,, K. Mallappa (Coorg)
7 ,, Manjaya Shetty
8 ,, B. N. Boranna Gowda
9 ,, K. Kenchappa
10 Sri B. K. Puttaramiah
11 ,, B. R. Patil
12 ,, V. S. Patil and
13 the mover

with instructions to report to the House within 10 days."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I appoint Sri M. P. Patil, Minister for Revenue, as the Chairman of the Committee.

MYSORE COURT FEES AND SUITS VALUATION BILL, 1957.

Motion to consider.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA (Minister for Labour and Legal Affairs).—Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Mysore Court Fees and Suits Valuation Bill, 1957, as reported by the Select Committee, be taken into consideration."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

"That the Mysore Court Fees and Suits Valuation Bill, 1957,as reported by the Select Committee be taken into consideration."

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Sir, I have absolutely no doubt in my mind that every one of the Hon'ble Members has read the Bill, studied it and read the Report because the Report has been fairly detailed. I may also mention for the information of the House that there have been eight sittings at which considerable time has been spent and all possible thought then available has been bestowed and the Bill has been modified to the extent that is reported in the Report. May I bring to the notice of the House that there are nearly 24 changes which have been brought about and there is no substantial reduction in the levels of taxation proposed in the Bill. I do not think it will be necessary for me to read the whole Report or to get into great details except to say that that even the most controversial points as they were supposed to be, namely, the valuation of the market value for the purpose of computing court fees, no longer remain

so as the rates have been very much reduced as can be seen not only in clause 7 (a) but also in 7 (b) and 7 (c). Further, in the succeeding clauses it will be seen there has been a very substantial reduction in the rates and it will be but proper for me to say that the various representations that were made to the Committee by the various Bar Associations, persons interested in litigation, members of the Bar individually and, above all, the various Hon'ble Members who participated in the discussion, have been extremely helpful to enable the Government to come to the right conclusions which have been embodied in the Report. It can be seen from the Report that the Government has gone a fairly long way in meeting the popular demand so far as court fees are concerned which ought not to be made excessively heavy. At the same time, so far as the expenses of maintaining the courts and other incidental expenses are concerned, we must see that the courts are able to defray them without encroaching as far as possible upon the other revenues. The idea has been mentioned that, so far as litigation is concerned, it ought not to be made to pay anything at all.

In other words, justice should be rendered free and full and easy. That is a very good idea. But having regard to the circumstance that we are not a single nation by ourselves, that there are a very large number of nations all over the world who are also facing similar difficulty or position of administering justice and we find that in no country is it possible to give all the administration free and without any court-fee being levied. I certainly feel that the aspect of the suggestion that it ought to be absolutely free will not be very seriously noted. I have to refer to that aspect particularly because of the note of dissent from my much respected friend the Leader of the Opposition. This dissenting note which he has written I have read at least a dozen times and I am still trying to understand it in order to have a full grasp over it. I am still perusing it for a full comprehension. In another note, that is, the note written by Sri Venkatai Gowda, I find that one or two suggestions have been made. They will certainly be placed before the House for consideration and I do not wish to make any comment with regard to that part of the dissenting note of Sri Venkatai Gowda as it is in the hands of everybody. But as regards the note to which I have already made a passing reference, that is, the note of my friend the Leader of Opposition, I find a large number of principles enunciated and the only operative portion is in the last paragraph:— "Therefore, excepting the aspects of removing the anomalies, the provisions contained in the Acts which are in force in old Mysore State may be adopted." I am aware of the old Mysore State having one Act. It may be that it has been amended. I have not been able to understand the first part of the sentence "Therefore excepting the aspect of removing the anomalies ....." I feel it would not be wrong on the part of the Leader of Opposition in being a little more precise. No doubt, in one part of the area the fee is at a higher level and in some other part it is at a lower level. My suggestion is that out of the 3 or 4 or 5 levels, take a particular level. The removal of anomalies is not possible unless they are a little more precise. I do not wish to say anything more except that I do not wish to engage the attention and time of the House by referring every clause seriatim as is referred to in the Report. Therefore, I would leave the matter in the hands of the members, but I am sure a very large agreement will be arrived at and the Report will find easy acceptance of almost every member.

Sri K. KENCHAPPA (Hiriyur).—I wanted to make a statement, but since it is already 5·30, we may take it up day after to-morrow. Even if we commence now, it will not be over.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I can see the difficulty. Of course, we have to sit till 6 o'clock. Perhaps the Hon'ble Members from the Opposition were under the impression that this Bill

(MR. SPEAKER)

might not be reached to-day. I see that under the circumstances it is better that we should rise now and meet day after to-morrow at 1 P.M.

The House adjourned at Five Minutes past Five of the Clock to meet again at One of the Clock on Thursday, the 6th March 1958.